LOCAL GOVERNMENT FARM AND RANCH SOLID WASTE CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT GRANT PROGRAM SCORING CRITERIA

Applicants will be ranked according to the Preference Review Criteria points only when it is necessary for grant proposals to compete for limited funds. Proposals with the highest rank will receive funds first, and be removed from the list. This process will continue until there are no more funds available for that fiscal year. Each fiscal year will start a new list.

Points	Description
40	 NEED – Grant proposal clearly describes and demonstrates the local or statewide need for the project and the benefits and end products resulting from the project. For example, proposal: Provides convincing reasons why the project should be funded Addresses identified gap in service availability or current need Describes and documents the problem Supports the existence of the problem with surveys, studies, and /or pictures Adequately describes any health and safety threats or environmental concerns
15	OBJECTIVES – Work Statement and grant narrative are sufficiently detailed to determine that the project: Is based on the identified need described in the narrative Describes specific and measurable goals and objectives Demonstrates that objectives can be achieved within indicated time frame
15	 METHODOLOGY Grant proposal describes by task the activities to be undertaken to achieve the objectives. For example, proposal: Describes why the proposed activities are the best way to address the identified need Describes in detail how the objectives will be met with available time and resources Identifies staffing required to carry out the proposed project Describes involvement of cooperating organizations Presents a specific plan for future funding
10	4. EVALUATION – Grant proposal describes a method to evaluate the success of the project and determine whether objectives were accomplished. For example, proposal: Includes both process and outcome evaluation Describes a method for evaluating and modifying methods during project implementation Describes clearly the criteria for determining success States who will be responsible for the evaluation Explains any statistical tests or questionnaires to be used Describes any evaluation reports to be produced
10	 5. BUDGET Grant proposal demonstrates that the project is cost effective in relation to the location, source, quality, and quantity of targeted wastes. For example: Budget itemization is sufficiently detailed to determine that proposed expenses are reasonable Quotes, estimates, or other documentation to support the costs claimed are provided All program tasks described in the Work Statement and narrative are itemized in the budget Cost savings are described, e.g., use of volunteer labor, in-kind services, recycling options, use of existing promotional materials etc. Budget items for miscellaneous, contingency, or managerial costs are clearly described and kept to a minimum
10	 6. COMPLETENESS, LETTERS OF SUPPORT, EXPERIENCE, ETC Grant Proposal is clearly presented and complete as required in the application instructions including adherence to all specified deadlines. Includes evidence that the applicant or its contractor(s) have sufficient staff resources, technical expertise and experience successfully managing grant programs, to carry out the proposed project. For example, proposal: Includes letters of support for the project: Addresses ability of the applicant to coordinate contracted activities, if applicable Includes resumes, endorsements, references, etc. Describes past grants received from CIWMB and relationship to current proposal

FARM AND RANCH SOLID WASTE CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT GRANT PROGRAM PREFERENCE SCORING CRITERIA

Applicants will be ranked according to the Preference Review Criteria points when it is necessary to grant proposals to compete for limited funds. Proposals with the highest rank will receive funds first, and be removed from the list. This process will continue until there are no more funds available for that fiscal year. Each fiscal year will start a new list.

Points	Description
25	EXHIBIT C – DESCRIPTION OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY AND /OR ENVIRONMENTAL THREAT – The score will be based on the level of health and safety threats or environmental concerns described in the application. The levels of public nuisance will a considering factor in the scoring, also.
15	EXHIBIT E – WORKPLAN – The work plan section of the application will be scored based on: The project will be scored based on the environmental soundness and practicality of the proposal. The quality and maximization of the recycling component of the proposal.
15	EXHBIT G –. OWNER RESPONSIBLITY - How clearly does proposal show that: ◆ The owner is not responsible for the illegal disposal. ◆ The owner or responsible parties do not have the ability to promptly and properly remediate the site without monetary assistance
20	EXHIBIT H - USE OF FUNDS -The proposal will evaluate the agency's ability to appropriately use funds, including; Maximization of available funds The ability of the City or County to adequately remediate the site with available funds;
10	EXHIBIT I – FUNDING OPTIONS – The proposal will also be evaluated on: ◆ Whether the site has ever received money for cleanup from the CIWMB or other state or federal funds will be given preference. ◆ Whether the site is eligible for other assistance from other federal or state agencies.
15	EXHIBIT J - INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS- The applicant will be evaluated on the agency's quality of programs to control illegal dumping in their jurisdiction.

Note: Exhibits correspond to the grant application requirements so they can be easily be found and coordinated with the information in the application.